United Nations A/HRC/39/21

General Assembly

Distr.: General
13 August 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-ninth session
10–28 September 2018
Agenda items 2 and 8
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles)

**Report of the Secretary-General*, **

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 33/15 and contains information on activities carried out from November 2016 to May 2018 by the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in considering and reviewing applications of national human rights institutions for accreditation and reaccreditation.

* The present report was submitted after the deadline in order to reflect the most recent information.
** The annex to the present report is circulated as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.18-13279(E)
1813279

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Accreditation during the period under review	3
	A. Session of November 2016	4
	B. Session of March 2017	4
	C. Session of November 2017	5
	D. Session of May 2018	5
III.	Amendments to the accreditation process	6
	A. Amendments to the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	6
	B. Amendments to the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation	6
	C. Amendments to the general observations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation	7
IV.	Participatory rights of institutions with A status in United Nations mechanisms and processes	8
V.	Conclusions and recommendations	8
Annex		
	Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	10

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 33/15, in which the Secretary-General was requested to report to the Council at its thirty-ninth session on the activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).[1]

2. The Paris Principles set a number of criteria necessary for a national human rights body to be considered as a national human rights institution. These include a broad mandate to promote and protect all human rights, clearly set forth in a constitutional or legislative text, affirming the independence of the institution, and indicating its sphere of competence and composition.

3. The Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (hereinafter the Statute) mandates the Subcommittee on Accreditation to review and analyse the compliance of national human rights institutions with the Paris Principles and to accredit them as fully (A status) or partially (B status) compliant with these Principles. It is recalled that the C status classification, for institutions not compliant at all with the Paris Principles, was abolished in 2015.

4. To ensure a fair balance of regional representation, the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation (art. 3.1) require that it be composed of one national human rights institution with A status from each of the four regional networks of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe), appointed by the regional networks for a renewable term of three years. The members of the Subcommittee designate their Chair by consensus from among themselves, for a renewable term of one year.

5. Article 6 of the Statute of the Global Alliance requires that its general and Bureau meetings and the meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation be held under the auspices of and in cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The latter therefore assumes the secretariat functions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation. This entails the analysis and preparation of accreditation files, as well as the presence of OHCHR at all meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, including during the deliberations and the adoption of reports.

II. Accreditation during the period under review

6. On 20 February 2018, the Chair of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions convened a retreat on accreditation involving the members of the Subcommittee on Accreditation[2] and its secretariat, the representative of the Global Alliance in Geneva and the representatives of the four regional networks of national human rights institutions. The retreat reviewed the working methods of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, including procedures and practices, and clarified procedural and substantive issues.

---

[1] See General Assembly resolution 48/134, annex.

[2] In February 2018, the members of the Subcommittee on Accreditation were the national human rights institutions of Canada, France, Morocco and the Philippines. For Asia and the Pacific, the national human rights institution of Qatar replaced that of the Philippines, which was unable to attend the retreat.

7. During the period under review, the Subcommittee on Accreditation convened four times: from 14 to 18 November 2016; from 13 to 17 March 2017; from 13 to 17 November 2017; and from 14 to 18 May 2018. The annex below shows the accreditation status granted to each institution at each of these sessions.

A. Session of November 2016

8. At the session of November 2016, the Subcommittee consisted of the national human rights institutions of Canada (chairmanship), France, Jordan and Mauritania. As the national human rights institutions of Jordan and Mauritania were up for their periodic review, they were replaced during their review by the institutions of Qatar and Morocco, respectively.

9. In accordance with article 15 of the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions,[3] the Subcommittee reviewed the continued full compliance with the Paris Principles of the national human rights institutions of Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, India, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mexico, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia.

10. The national human rights institution of Burundi was the subject of a special review under article 16.2 of the Statute.[4]

B. Session of March 2017

11. During the session of March 2017, the Subcommittee consisted of the national human rights institutions of Canada (chairmanship), France, Jordan and Mauritania.

12. The Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed for accreditation under article 10 of the Statute[5] the national human rights institutions of Liberia, Lithuania, the Niger and Norway.

13. Pursuant to article 14.1 of the Statute,[6] the national human rights institution of Egypt was reviewed for deferral.

14. Under article 15 of the Statute, the Subcommittee reviewed the A status of the national human rights institutions of Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Indonesia, Peru and the Philippines.

15. The national human rights institutions of Greece, which, in May 2016, had been given one year to establish its continued conformity with the Paris Principles, was reviewed under article 18.1 of the Statute.[7]

---

[3] Article 15 provides that A status national human rights institutions are subject to reaccreditation every five years.

[4] In accordance with article 16.2, the Chair of the Global Alliance or the Subcommittee on Accreditation may initiate a special review of the status of a national human rights institution where new circumstances may affect its compliance with the Paris Principles.

[5] Article 10 foresees that any national human rights institution seeking accreditation under the Paris Principles should apply to the Chair of the Global Alliance.

[6] Article 14.1 provides that the Subcommittee on Accreditation may decide to defer an application to a later session.

[7] In accordance with article 18.1, when the Subcommittee decides to downgrade an A status institution, the latter has the opportunity to provide in writing, within one year of receipt of such notice, the evidence deemed necessary to establish its continued conformity with the Paris Principles.

16. The national human rights institution of Azerbaijan challenged the recommendation made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation during that session concerning its status. In accordance with article 12.1 (viii) of the Statute,[8] the recommendation of the Subcommittee was referred to the following meeting of the Bureau of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, which endorsed it. As required by article 18.1, the Bureau gave the national human rights institution of Azerbaijan one year to establish its continued conformity with the Paris Principles.

C. Session of November 2017

17. At the session of November 2017, the Subcommittee was constituted of the national human rights institutions of Canada, France (chairmanship), Mauritania and the Philippines. Since the national human rights institution of Mauritania was under review, the national human rights institution of Morocco replaced it for the whole session.[9]

18. The national human rights institutions of Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, India, Mauritania, Nicaragua and the United Republic of Tanzania were reviewed under article 14.1 of the Statute of the Global Alliance.

19. The Subcommittee also reviewed the reaccreditation of the national human rights institutions of Denmark, Panama, Poland, Portugal and South Africa, under article 15 of the Statute.

20. Under article 18.1 of the Statute, the Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institution of Burundi.

21. The national human rights institution of Mauritania challenged the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Accreditation. It was referred to the following meeting of the Bureau of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, which endorsed it. The national human rights institution of Mauritania was granted one year to establish its continued conformity with the Paris Principles.[10]

D. Session of May 2018

22. The national human rights institutions of Canada, France (chairmanship), Morocco and the Philippines formed the Subcommittee for its session of May 2018.

23. Under article 10 of the Statute of the Global Alliance, the Subcommittee reviewed the status of the national human rights institutions of Belgium and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

24. Based on article 14.1 of the Statute, the Subcommittee also reviewed the national human rights institutions of Egypt and Nicaragua.

25. The Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institutions of Algeria, Guatemala, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Sri Lanka and Uganda under article 15 of the Statute.

---

[8] In accordance with article 12.1 (viii), when an applicant institution has successfully challenged a recommendation of the Subcommittee (by receiving the support of at least four Bureau members from at least two regional groups), the recommendation of the Subcommittee is referred to the following meeting of the Bureau of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions for a decision.

[9] See new article 3.1 of the Subcommittee on Accreditation's rules of procedure.

[10] See article 18.1 of the Statute of the Global Alliance.

26. Under article 18.1 of the Statute, the Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institution of Azerbaijan.

27. In accordance with article 16.2 of the Statute, the Subcommittee decided to initiate a special review of the national human rights institutions of Chile and Ecuador at its session in October 2018.

III. Amendments to the accreditation process

28. The Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation and its general observations were amended in March 2017 and February 2018 to further improve the accreditation procedure.

A. Amendments to the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

29. Article 12 of the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions was amended to introduce a procedure for institutions to challenge the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Accreditation. The procedure requires that a Bureau member challenging a recommendation of the Subcommittee concerning its accreditation should be excluded from participating in the Bureau hearings and deliberation of the challenge (art. 12.7). An alternate member should then be appointed by the relevant regional network to replace that member and participate in the entire Bureau meeting (art. 12.8).

30. The option for the Subcommittee on Accreditation to defer a decision on accreditation or reaccreditation was formalized in article 14.1, as this practice was not yet enshrined in the Statute. The procedure now also provides that deferrals of accreditation or reaccreditation and special reviews of the status of institutions are decisions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, and not recommendations to the Bureau of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (arts. 14 and 16.3). Unlike recommendations, decisions cannot be challenged under article 12.

B. Amendments to the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation

31. To ensure the participation of all regional networks in the sessions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, article 3.1 of the rules of procedure now provides that, when a member is unavailable to attend a session, an alternate from the same regional network should be appointed. The same applies if a member's institution is under review during a session, a conflict of interest has been identified or a member's institution is under notice of intention to downgrade its status.

32. A major new provision in the rules of procedure (art. 4.7) allows a national human rights institution under review to inform the secretariat when it considers that a member of the Subcommittee on Accreditation has a real or perceived conflict of interest in the review. This is facilitated by the posting of participants attending the sessions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation on the website of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions by the secretariat ahead of the session (art. 4.3). The Bureau will assess if there is a real or perceived conflict of interest, and if the member can attend the session of the Subcommittee on Accreditation.

33. The rules of procedure (art. 4.4) provide that the presence of all four members of the Subcommittee on Accreditation constitutes a quorum. However, in specific circumstances when no alternate member has been appointed by a regional network, the presence of three members is sufficient.

34. To avoid any deadlock in the deliberations of the Subcommittee, the rules of procedure (art. 4.5) now provide that the Chairperson will have a casting vote when a vote is tied and further deliberation is unlikely to result in a decision.

35. Another key amendment to the rules of procedure prevents a member of the Subcommittee on Accreditation whose institution is under notice of intention to downgrade its status from attending the session of the Subcommittee during which that institution will be reviewed and provides that the member be replaced by an alternate appointed by the relevant regional network (in accordance with new article 4.8 and article 3.1).

36. According to the amended procedures (art. 6.4), the Subcommittee determines whether an institution is a national human rights institution, and whether it is a new or continuing national human rights institution.

C. Amendments to the general observations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation

37. The Subcommittee on Accreditation, in cooperation with its secretariat, has drafted general observations to interpret the Paris Principles in order to enhance their understanding and implementation by all national human rights institutions. The general observations have been adopted by the Bureau of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions. To date 20 general observations have been issued. Amendments to these general observations were proposed by the Subcommittee on Accreditation and endorsed by the Bureau of the Global Alliance in March 2017 and February 2018.

38. A new paragraph has been added to general observation 1.4 on interaction with the international human rights system to emphasize that national human rights institutions must maintain their independence and participate in sessions of United Nations human rights mechanisms in their own right or in a manner that clearly distinguishes them as independent national human rights institutions.

39. General observation 1.9 on political representatives in national human rights institutions has been amended to emphasize that representatives of Governments, government agencies and parliamentarians should not be members of, nor participate in, the decision-making organs of a national human rights institution.

40. To avoid any confusion, general observation 2.3 on functional immunity has been retitled "Protection from criminal and civil liability for official actions and decisions undertaken in good faith". The general observation has furthermore been amended to take into account national contexts where functional immunity is not part of the legal tradition and to provide that such protection be made available to members of national human rights institutions' decision-making bodies as well as staff.

41. Former general observation 2.5 on staffing by secondment has been merged with general observation 2.4 on recruitment and retention of national human rights institution staff, which now requires national human rights institutions to be empowered by law to determine the staffing structure and the skills required to fulfil their mandate. It also provides that their staff should be recruited according to an open, transparent and merit-based selection process and that a national human rights institution should be able, and be perceived to be able, to operate independently from government interference, and should not be required to accept staff assigned to it by a Government.

IV. Participatory rights of institutions with A status in United Nations mechanisms and processes

42. The Human Rights Council and the General Assembly, in their respective resolutions 16/21 and 65/281 on reviewing the work and functioning of the Human Rights Council, have granted increased opportunities and visibility to national human rights institutions with A status. In particular, under the universal periodic review, the stakeholders' reports include a section dedicated to the contributions of national human rights institutions. Moreover, during the review of a Member State, institutions with A status are entitled to intervene immediately after the presentation of that State during the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council plenary. Institutions with A status are also able to intervene immediately after the State concerned during the interactive dialogue between the Human Rights Council and special procedure mandate holders following their presentation of their country mission reports. Furthermore, institutions with A status may nominate candidates for special procedure mandates.

43. In its resolution 72/181, the General Assembly encourages all relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes, in accordance with their respective mandates, to further enhance the participation of national human rights institutions compliant with the Paris Principles and to allow them to contribute.

44. Thus, in March 2018, the Commission on the Status of Women encouraged its secretariat to continue its consideration of the enhanced participation of national human rights institutions with A status. In June 2018, national human rights institutions were accredited to the Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. In July 2018, the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing invited national human rights institutions compliant with the Paris Principles to contribute to its ninth session, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Institutions with A status were also invited to contribute to the global compact for migration at all stages of its development.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

45. **The Paris Principles, and the general observations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation interpreting them, remain the basis upon which the Subcommittee accredits national human rights institutions.**

46. **The interdependence and indivisibility of human rights require that the mandate of national human rights institutions be broad, as set out in the Paris Principles, to include the promotion and protection of all human rights — civil, political, economic, social and cultural — for everyone.**

47. **The abolition of the C status accreditation classification in 2015 should not imply that all institutions reviewed for accreditation be granted at least B status, as this would undermine the credibility of accredited A status institutions and of the accreditation process.**

48. **Members of the Subcommittee participate as impartial, objective and independent experts, without consideration of national, regional and/or political considerations, as required by the rules of procedure.**

49. **Regional networks of national human rights institutions attend the sessions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation as observers. They should not advocate for a particular accreditation classification nor voice their opinions on the recommendations formulated by the Subcommittee. To ensure the credibility of the**

accreditation process, regional networks of national human rights institutions should appoint as members of the Subcommittee only national human rights institutions with a full mandate to promote and protect all human rights.

50. **The substantive and advisory role of OHCHR as the secretariat of the Subcommittee enhances the credibility of the accreditation process. The presence of OHCHR during the decision-making process is instrumental in attesting to the compliance of this process with the established rules of procedure, and contributes to its transparency, impartiality, fairness and rigour.**

51. **All the Subcommittee's communications to and from national human rights institutions should be channelled through the secretariat (OHCHR) to ensure compliance with the Subcommittee on Accreditation's rules of procedure and consistency with previous practice.**

52. **The Secretary-General encourages Member States and other stakeholders to enable OHCHR, through financial support, to maintain high-quality servicing of the Subcommittee on Accreditation.**

Annex

Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

Accreditation status as of 18 July 2018

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, the latter uses the following classifications for accreditation:

A: Fully compliant with the Paris Principles

B: Partially compliant with the Paris Principles

C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles

*A(R): The category of accreditation with reserve, previously granted where insufficient documentation had been submitted to allow for the conferral of A status, is no longer awarded. It is now used only when referring to institutions that were accredited with this status before April 2008.

A status institutions (80)

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 — A*
		November 2008
		November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — A
Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission	A	1999
		October 2006
		May 2011
		November 2016 — A
India: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999
		October 2006
		May 2011 — A*
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — A
Indonesia: National Commission on Human Rights	A	2000
		March 2007
		March 2012*
		November 2013 — special review in March 2014
		March 2014 — A*
		March 2017 — A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Jordan: National Centre for Human Rights	A	April 2006 (B)
		March 2007 (B)
		October 2007 — A*
		October 2010 — A
		November 2015 — deferred to second session of 2016
		November 2016 — A
Malaysia: Human Rights Commission	A	2002
		April 2008 — recommended to be accredited B
		November 2009 — A*
		October 2010 — A
		November 2015 — A
Mongolia: National Human Rights Commission	A	2002 — A(R)
		2003
		November 2008
		November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — A
Nepal: National Human Rights Commission	A	2001 — A(R)
		2002 — A
		October 2007 — A*
		November 2008 — A*
		March 2010 — recommended to be accredited B
		May 2011 — A
		November 2012 — October 2014 special review — A maintained
New Zealand: Human Rights Commission	A	1999
		October 2006
		May 2011
		May 2016 — A
Philippines: Commission on Human Rights	A	1999
		March 2007 — deferred to October 2007
		October 2007
		March 2012
		March 2017 — A
Qatar: National Human Rights Committee	A	October 2006 (B)
		March 2009 — A*
		March 2010 — A*
		October 2010 — A
		November 2015 — A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Republic of Korea: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004
		November 2008
		March 2014 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — deferred to March 2015
		March 2015 — deferred to first session of 2016
		May 2016 — A
Samoa: Office of the Ombudsman	A	May 2016 — A
Sri Lanka: Human Rights Commission	A	2000
		October 2007
		March 2009
		May 2018 — A
State of Palestine: Independent Commission for Human Rights	A	2005 — A(R)
		March 2009 — A
		November 2015 — A
Timor-Leste: Provedoria for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008
		November 2013
Africa		
Cameroon: National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms	A	1999
		October 2006 (B)
		March 2010 — A
		March 2015 — deferred to first session of 2016
		May 2016 — deferred to second session of 2016
		November 2016 — deferred to March 2017
		March 2017 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — A
Democratic Republic of the Congo: National Human Rights Commission	A	May 2018

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	April 2006 (B)
		October 2006 — A
		October 2011 — deferred to November 2012
		November 2012 — deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 — deferred to November 2013
		November 2013 — deferred
		November 2015 — deferred to second session of 2016
		November 2016 — deferred to March 2017
		March 2017 — deferred to first session of 2018
		May 2018 — A
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	2001
		November 2008
		March 2014
Kenya: National Commission on Human Rights	A	2005
		November 2008
		October 2014 — A
Liberia: Independent National Commission on Human Rights	A	March 2017 — A
Malawi: Human Rights Commission	A	2000
		March 2007
		March 2012 — deferred to November 2012
		November 2012 — deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 — deferred to November 2013
		November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — deferred to March 2015
		March 2015 — deferred to first session of 2016
		May 2016 — deferred to second session of 2016
		November 2016 — A
Mauritania: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	November 2009 (B)
		May 2011 — A
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
Mauritius: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	2002
		April 2008 — A*
		October 2014 — A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Morocco: Conseil national des droits de l'homme	A	1999 — A(R)
		2001
		October 2007 — A*
		October 2010 — A*
		November 2015 — A
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 — A(R)
		April 2006
		May 2011
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — deferred to second session of 2018
Niger: Commission Nationale des Droits Humains	A	March 2017 — A
Nigeria: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 — A(R)
		2000 — A
		October 2006 — A
		October 2007 — B
		May 2011 — A
		November 2016 — A
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001
		October 2007
		March 2012 — recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		May 2013 — A
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2011 — A
		May 2016 — A
South Africa: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 — A(R)
		2000
		October 2007
		November 2012
		November 2017 — A
Togo: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	1999 — A(R)
		2000
		October 2007
		November 2012 — deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 — A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Uganda: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 — A(R)
		2001
		April 2008
		May 2013 — A
		May 2018 — A
United Republic of Tanzania: Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance	A	2003 — A(R)
		October 2006 — A
		October 2011 — A*
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — A
Zambia: Human Rights Commission	A	2003 — A(R)
		October 2006
		October 2011
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — deferred to second session of 2018
Zimbabwe: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2016 — A
Americas		
Argentina: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999
		October 2006
		October 2011
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — deferred to second session of 2018
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 (B)
		2000 — A
		March 2007
		March 2012
		March 2017
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999
		October 2006
		May 2011
		May 2016
Chile: Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos	A	November 2012
		May 2018 — special review in second session of 2018

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Colombia: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2001
		October 2007
		March 2012 — A*
		March 2017
Costa Rica: Defensoría de los Habitantes	A	1999
		October 2006
		October 2011
		November 2016
Ecuador: Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 — A(R)
		2002
		April 2008 — recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		March 2009 — A
		March 2015
		May 2018 — special review in second session of 2018
El Salvador: Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006
		May 2011
		November 2016
Guatemala: Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos	A	1999 (B)
		2000 — A(R)
		2002
		April 2008
		May 2013 — A
		May 2018 — A
Haiti: Office for the Protection of Citizens	A	November 2013
Mexico: Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	A	1999
		October 2006
		October 2011
		November 2016 — A
Nicaragua: Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006
		May 2011
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — deferred to first session of 2018
		May 2018 — recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Panama: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999
		October 2006
		November 2012
		November 2017 — A
Peru: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999
		March 2007
		March 2012
		March 2017 — A
Uruguay: Institución Nacional de Derechos Humanos y Defensoría del Pueblo	A	May 2016 — A
Europe		
Albania: People's Advocate	A	2003 — A(R)
		2004
		November 2008
		November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — A
Armenia: Human Rights Defender	A	April 2006 — A(R)
		October 2006 — A
		October 2011 — deferred to November 2012
		November 2012 — deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 — A
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	A	October 2006 — A
		October 2010 — deferred to May 2011
		May 2011 — recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		March 2012 — A
		March 2017 — recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		May 2018 — recommended to be downgraded to B status[11]

[11] In accordance with article 12.1 of the Statute of the Global Alliance, the institution has challenged the recommendation and has received the support of one Bureau member of the Global Alliance to date.

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Institute of Human Rights Ombudsmen	A	2001 — A(R)
		2002 — A(R)
		2003 — A(R)
		November 2009 — recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		October 2010 — A
		November 2016 — deferred to second session of 2017
		November 2017 — A
Croatia: Ombudsman	A	April 2008
		May 2013
Denmark: Danish Institute for Human Rights	A	1999 (B)
		2001
		October 2007 — A
		November 2012
		November 2017 — deferred to second session of 2018
Finland: Finnish National Human Rights Institution	A	October 2014 — A
France: Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme	A	1999
		October 2007
		November 2012 — deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 — A
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007
		November 2012 — deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 — A
Germany: German Institute for Human Rights	A	2001 — A(R)
		2002 — A(R)
		2003
		November 2008
		November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		March 2015 — deferred to November 2015
		November 2015 — A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Greece: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2000 — A(R)
		2001
		October 2007 — A*
		November 2009 — A*
		March 2010 — A*
		March 2015 — deferred to first session of 2016
		May 2016 — recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		March 2017 — A
Hungary: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights	A	November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — A
Ireland: Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission	A	November 2015 — A
Latvia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia	A	March 2015 — A
Lithuania: Seimas Ombudsmen Office	A	March 2017— A
Luxembourg: Commission consultative des droits de l'homme	A	2001 — A(R)
		2002
		March 2009 — A*
		November 2009 — A*
		October 2010 — A
		November 2015 — A
Netherlands: Netherlands Institute for Human Rights	A	March 2014
Norway: Norwegian National Human Rights Institution	A	March 2017 — A
Poland: Commissioner for Human Rights	A	1999
		October 2007
		November 2012
		November 2017 — A
Portugal: Provedor de Justiça	A	1999
		October 2007
		November 2012
		November 2017 — A
Republic of Moldova: Office of the People's Advocate of Moldova	A	November 2009 — B
		May 2018 — A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	A	2000 (B)
		2001 (B)
		November 2008 — A
		November 2013 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — A
Serbia: Protector of Citizens	A	March 2010 — A
		March 2015 — A
Spain: Defensor del Pueblo	A	2000
		October 2007
		November 2012
		May 2018 — A
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	April 2008 (B)
		March 2009 — A
		March 2014 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:		
Great Britain: Equality and Human Rights Commission	A	November 2008 — A
		October 2010 — special review; A
		November 2015 — A
Northern Ireland: Human Rights Commission	A	2001 (B)
		May 2011
		May 2016 — A
Scotland: Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	November 2009 — deferred to March 2010
		March 2010 — A
		March 2015 — A

B status institutions (32)

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Americas		
Honduras: Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	B	2000
		October 2007 (A)
		October 2010 — special review; recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		October 2011 — B
		May 2016 — B

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of): Defensoría del Pueblo	B	2002
		April 2008
		May 2013
		March 2014 — special review in October 2014
		October 2014 — special review deferred to March 2015
		March 2015 — recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		May 2016 — recommended to be downgraded to B status
		October 2016 — downgraded to B status
Asia and the Pacific		
Bahrain: National Institution for Human Rights	B	May 2016 — B
Bangladesh: National Human Rights Commission	B	May 2011 — B
		March 2015 — B
Iraq: High Commission for Human Rights	B	March 2015 — B
Maldives: Human Rights Commission	B	April 2008
		March 2010
Myanmar: Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2015 — B
Oman: National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission	B	2004
		November 2008
		November 2013 — deferred to March 2014
		March 2014 — deferred to October 2014
		October 2014 — recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
		November 2015 — B
Central Asia		
Kazakhstan: Commissioner for Human Rights	B	March 2012
Kyrgyzstan: Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Tajikistan: Human Rights Ombudsman	B	March 2012

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Algeria: National Human Rights Council of Algeria	B	2000 — A(R) 2002 — A(R) 2003 — A March 2009 — B March 2010 — deferred to October 2010 October 2010 — B May 2018 — B
Burundi: Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme	B	November 2012 May 2016 — special review in second session of 2016 November 2016 — recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles November 2017 — B
Chad: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	2000 — A(R) 2001 — A(R) 2003 — A(R) November 2009 — B
Congo: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	October 2010
Côte d'Ivoire: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	May 2016 — B
Ethiopia: Ethiopian Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Libya: National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights	B	October 2014 — B
Mali: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	March 2012
Senegal: Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme	B	2000 October 2007 — A* October 2010 — deferred to May 2011 May 2011 — deferred to October 2011 October 2011 — recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles November 2012 — B
Tunisia: Comité supérieur des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales	B	November 2009
Europe		
Austria: Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 May 2011

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Belgium: Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunity and Opposition to Racism and Discrimination	B	May 2018
Bulgaria: Commission for Protection against Discrimination	B	October 2011
Bulgaria: Ombudsman	B	October 2011
Cyprus: Commissioner for Administration and Human Rights	B	November 2015 — B
Montenegro: Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms	B	May 2016 — B
Slovakia: National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 — C October 2007 March 2012 — accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation March 2014 — B
Slovenia: Human Rights Ombudsman	B	2000 March 2010
Sweden: Equality Ombudsman	B	May 2011
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Ombudsman	B	October 2011

C status institutions (10)

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Benin: Commission béninoise des droits de l'homme	C	2002
Madagascar: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	C	2000 — A(R) 2002 — A(R) 2003 — A(R) April 2006 — status withdrawn October 2006 — C
Americas		
Antigua and Barbuda: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Barbados: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Puerto Rico (United States of America): Oficina del Procurador del Ciudadano del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico	C	March 2007

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Hong Kong, China: Equal Opportunities Commission	C	2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of): Islamic Human Rights Commission	C	2000
Europe		
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007 May 2011
Switzerland: Federal Commission for Women's Issues	C	March 2009
Switzerland: Federal Commission against Racism	C	1998 — (B) March 2010 — C

Suspended institutions

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Fiji: Human Rights Commission	Suspended Note: The Commission resigned from the then International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on 2 April 2007	2000 (A) March 2007 — accreditation suspended; documents to be submitted at October 2007 session
Americas		
Paraguay: Defensoría del Pueblo	Suspended Note: The Defensoría resigned from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on 10 July 2014	2003 November 2008 November 2013 — deferred to March 2014 March 2014 — deferred to October 2014 October 2014 — suspended

Institutions whose accreditation has lapsed

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Burkina Faso: Commission nationale des droits humains		2002 — A(R) 2003 — A(R) 2005 — B March 2012 — accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Europe		
Norway: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights		In view of the establishment of the Norwegian National Human Rights Institution and its accreditation in March 2017, accreditation of the Centre lapsed

Dissolved institutions

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Europe		
Belgium: Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism		December 2014 The institution split into two: The Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Discrimination and Racism; The Federal Centre for the Analysis of Migration Flows
Hungary: Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights		May 2011 The institution ceased to exist in view of the establishment of a new institution: the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights
Ireland: Irish Human Rights Commission		November 2014 The institution has been dissolved by the 2014 Act that established the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission
Netherlands: Equal Treatment Commission		1999 2004 March 2010 The institution ceased to exist in view of the establishment of a new institution: the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights